

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 14 and 25 have been allowed.

Claims 5, 7, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of base claim 4. Claim 5 is accordingly now in condition for allowance.

Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 7. Claim 6 is accordingly now in condition for allowance.

Claims 8 and 14 are objected to because of certain claim informalities. Claim 8 has been canceled and claim 14 has been amended to correct the noted informalities. However, Applicants do not think the “over to” language suggested by the Examiner is correct. The claim language as now presented in amended claim 14 appears to be correct.

Claims 4, 8, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirose.

In claim 4, Applicants claim “reading, by the receiver block, of the data signal with a *different sampling period than the transmission period* of the transmitter block” (emphasis added). The Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by Hirose because block A and block B inherently operate with *different clock signals*.

First, the Examiner fails to cite to any support from the Hirose specification for the assertion that block A and block B must have different clock signals.

Second, even if one assumes that block A and block B have different clock signals, the language of claim 4 requires “reading, by the receiver block, of the data signal with a *different sampling period than the transmission period* of the transmitter block”. The focus of the claim language is on different sampling periods. The Examiner’s analysis of Hirose completely fails to address this critical claim language. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hirose for the claimed different sampling periods.

Applicants accordingly submit that claim 4 is not anticipated by Hirose.

In claim 22, Applicants claim that “the first, second and third communication lines are *bi-directional*.” The Examiner points to Hirose Figure 5A. This figure is not pertinent to the claimed invention. Applicants point out that the CMD_READY_A line and the STRB_B line

identified by the Examiner are clearly shown to be UNI-DIRECTIONAL lines, NOT BI-directional lines as claimed. There is no anticipation of claim 22.

Claims 4, 8, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Upp.

Again, claim 4 recites “reading, by the receiver block, of the data signal with a *different sampling period than the transmission period* of the transmitter block” (emphasis added). With respect to claim 4, Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s technical analysis.

First, the Examiner’s statement concerning “different clock signals” does not appear to be accurate since Upp teaches communicating the clock signal between the master 111 and the user 112. There accordingly appears to be just one clock signal at issue in Upp (not different clocks as alleged by the Examiner).

Second, the language of claim 4 requires “reading, by the receiver block, of the data signal with a *different sampling period than the transmission period* of the transmitter block”. The focus of the claim language is on different sampling periods. The Examiner’s analysis of Upp completely fails to address this critical claim language. There is no teaching or suggestion in Upp for the claimed different sampling periods.

Applicants accordingly submit that claim 4 is not anticipated by Upp.

In claim 22, Applicants claim that “the first, second and third communication lines are *bi-directional*.” Upp teaches multiple bi-directional lines. However, Applicants submit that Upp fails to teach the use of bi-directional lines connected in the manner recited by claim 22. Note that claim 22 recites a *first* BI-DIRECTIONAL communication line for carrying a data signal, a *second* BI-DIRECTIONAL communication line for carrying a congestion signal, and a *third* BI-DIRECTIONAL communication line for carrying a synchronization signal. The Upp reference does not teach each of these *three claimed* BI-DIRECTIONAL communications lines. Furthermore, the Examiner points to the FRAME line which is clearly shown to be a UNI-DIRECTIONAL line, NOT a BI-directional line as claimed. There is no anticipation of claim 22.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose or Upp in view of the admitted prior art.

Amended claim 6 is now in condition for allowance.

In claim 9, Applicants claim “wherein said first, second and third lines are split in corresponding stages, each stage being separated through a corresponding repeater, the repeaters of the first and third lines being of the tristate type *whose tristate condition is controlled by an output of the repeater of the second line* when a congestion event of the receiver block occurs so that the data signal and the synchro signal are stored in the stages of the first and second lines” (emphasis added). The Examiner concedes that Hirose and Upp fail to teach the claimed use of repeaters on the split first, second and third lines. It is the Examiner’s position that the admitted prior art teaches the use of repeaters. Applicants agree, but the admitted prior art fails to teach having the output of the repeater for the congestion (second) line control the tristate condition of the repeaters for both the data (first) line and synchro (third) line. Claim 9 is accordingly patentable over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of claim 9 is requested. Claim 19 is asserted to be patentable over Hirose/Upp and the admitted prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Hirose. Claims 11-12 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now ready for allowance.

Dated: January 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Andre M. Szuwalski/
Andre M. Szuwalski
Registration No.: 35,701
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP
3000 Thanksgiving Tower,
1601 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 999-4795
Attorneys For Applicant